## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are all the claims pending in the application. In response to the Office Action,

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-12, 15, 17-20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over previously cited McNabb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,462, hereafter

"McNabb") in view of newly cited Umbreit (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,787). Claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 21,

and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNabb in view of

Umbriet and further in view of Tashenberg (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

2001/0034711). Claims 8, 16, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over McNabb in view of Umbriet and further in view of Hepworth et al. (U.S.

Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0032920, hereafter "Hepworth"). Applicant

respectfully traverses the prior art rejections.

The Examiner alleges that McNabb discloses all of the elements of independent claim 1

and analogous independent claims 9 and 17 except for the elements "the data processing system

external to a classification engine" and "receiving the request directly at the database, from the

requestor, to access the contents of the classified table elements", as recited in independent claim

1 and analogously recited in independent claims 9 and 17. The Examiner thus relies on Umbriet

to allegedly cure these conceded deficiencies. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the

Examiner's position.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in McNabb of the

element "wherein the asking step comprises sending, by the database, arguments to input

classification parameters to the classification engine coupled to the data processing system", as

recited in the claims. According to this aspect of the claims, if the database, or more particularly,

the data table 52 of the database does not explicitly contain the classification level associated

with a particular row, the external classification engine is programmed to derive a classification

level that applies to a particular row in accordance with a defined algorithm based on the data in

one or more classification columns of the classified data table 52. The classification columns

comprise a subset of columns of the classified data table 52, and the <u>data in the classification</u>

<u>columns are passed to the external classification engine as arguments to input classification</u>

parameters, from which the classification level associated with the rows of data table 52 may be

derived. Applicant respectfully submits that this aspect of the claims is neither taught nor

suggested by McNabb.

The Examiner appears to read the claimed "asking step" on the "replies (SL$_2$) in FIG. 9 of

McNabb, and asserts:

> [T]he Examiner assumes that the reply comprising data requested by a user can be
> equivalent to classification parameters (i.e. returned data has been classified)) to
> the classification engine (Figure 9, element 504) coupled to the data processing
> system (Figure 9, element 510).[2]

However, the "replies (SL$_2$) step of McNabb is a reply from the database to a request

from the Security Gate 504. This clearly differs from the claimed invention, which requires that

a request is sent from the database to the classification engine.

Additionally Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in the

cited references that "a decision cache is checked by a processing exit of the data processing

---

[2] Page 3 of the Office Action dated August 1, 2008.

system to determine whether one of the indicators of approval or non-approval was returned for a same set of arguments for relevant classification parameters, and the external classification engine is not called if the determined indicator is already contained in the decision cache", as recited in amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17. Support for this aspect of the claims can be found at least in paragraph [0052] of the original specification.

Further, Umbreit does not cure the deficiencies of McNabb.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 should be allowable because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims. Claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 9, and 17.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark E. Wallerson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC                    Mark E. Wallerson
Telephone: (202) 293-7060             Registration No. 59,043
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

46159

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 1, 2008